

## INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Classification No.

PCT/EP 03/11064

## A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

IPC 7 B22F7/02 B22F1/00 C04B35/626 C04B35/71 B29C70/88

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

## B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)

IPC 7 B22F C04B B29C B28B C03C

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)

EPO-Internal, PAJ

## C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
X	US 4 851 190 A (BOWEN KIM E ET AL) 25 July 1989 (1989-07-25) column 1, line 15 - line 27; claims 1,3 abstract	15
A	---	1-14
X	WO 02 20863 A (CARTON ERIK PETER ;TNO (NL); EIJKEREN ERIC PETERUS HYACINTU (NL)) 14 March 2002 (2002-03-14) claims 4,8 abstract	15
A	---	1-14
A	GB 2 304 619 A (APV UK PLC) 26 March 1997 (1997-03-26) claim 25 -----	1-15

☐ Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.☒ Patent family members are listed in annex.

## \* Special categories of cited documents:

"A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance

"E" earlier document but published on or after the international filing date

"L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)

"O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means

"P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

"T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

"X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

"Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.

"Z" document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

9 February 2004

Date of mailing of the international search report

15.07.2004

Name and mailing address of the ISA

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2  
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk  
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 apo nl,  
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

LINDA MELIN /ELY

## INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International Application No

PCT/EP 03/11064

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date	Patent family member(s)	Publication date
US 4851190	A	25-07-1989	US 4900635 A	13-02-1990
WO 0220863	A	14-03-2002	NL 1016112 C2	07-03-2002
			AU 9438901 A	22-03-2002
			CA 2421429 A1	14-03-2002
			EP 1319090 A1	18-06-2003
			WO 0220863 A1	14-03-2002
GB 2304619	A	26-03-1997	WO 9709161 A1	13-03-1997

## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

## PCT

## INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

(PCT Article 18 and Rules 43 and 44)

Applicant's or agent's file reference GC17	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> see Notification of Transmittal of International Search Report (Form PCT/ISA/220) as well as, where applicable, item 5 below.	
International application No. PCT/EP 03/11064	International filing date (day/month/year) 23/09/2003	(Earliest) Priority Date (day/month/year) 26/09/2002
Applicant GIANTCODE A/S		

This International Search Report has been prepared by this International Searching Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 18. A copy is being transmitted to the International Bureau.

This International Search Report consists of a total of 3 sheets.

☒ It is also accompanied by a copy of each prior art document cited in this report.

## 1. Basis of the report

- a. With regard to the language, the international search was carried out on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ the international search was carried out on the basis of a translation of the international application furnished to this Authority (Rule 23.1(b)).

- b. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international search was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

☐ contained in the international application in written form.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

☐ the statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

☐ the statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

2. ☐ Certain claims were found unsearchable (See Box I).

3. ☐ Unity of invention is lacking (see Box II).

## 4. With regard to the title,

☐ the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.

☒ the text has been established by this Authority to read as follows:

METHOD OF FORMING GRADED PARTICULATE COMPOSITIONS

## 5. With regard to the abstract,

☒ the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.

☐ the text has been established, according to Rule 38.2(b), by this Authority as it appears in Box III. The applicant may, within one month from the date of mailing of this international search report, submit comments to this Authority.

## 6. The figure of the drawings to be published with the abstract is Figure No.

☐ as suggested by the applicant.

☐ because the applicant failed to suggest a figure.

☐ because this figure better characterizes the invention.

☐ None of the figures.